

Remarks

Claim 11, lines 8-9 was found to be unclear because the phrase "a plurality of controllers on said substrate for said receivers" was not understood. It was also noted that the term "configured to", which is defined as "adapted to or capable of being", was not a positive claim.

In response, claim 11 has been amended to recite "a plurality of controllers on said substrate", as suggested by the Examiner, deleting the term "for said receivers". The relationship between the controllers and the receivers is set forth at least in the final paragraph of the claim.

With respect to the objection to "configured to", the claim now recites "a plurality of electrical device receivers on said substrate, at least some of said receivers for receiving".

These amendments are believed to satisfy the objections to claim 11. They have also been carried over to claims 18 and 19, which have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 11.

Claims 11-17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richter et al. (U.S. Patent 5,905,885) in view of Hall, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent 6,346,842). Hall, Jr., et al. is cited as teaching a network comprising zero ohm resistors connected between a driver and a receiver. Zero ohm resistors per se are conceded in the application as being prior art.

Accordingly, the remainder of these comments will be directed to Richter et al.

Richter et al. employs nothing corresponding to applicants' "electrical device receivers". The Office action analogizes elements 114, 115, 118, 119 of Richter et al. to applicants' electrical device receivers. However, not only do these elements in Richter et al. not appear to be "receivers", they do not meet the claim requirement that they are for receiving a selectable one of multiple different electrical devices. Elements 114 and 115 are described in the specification of Richter et al. as disk drives (column 1, lines 28-30). The Richter et al. specification does not appear to define elements 118 and 119, but again there is nothing to indicate these elements are capable of receiving electrical devices having different respective interfaces. Elements 118 and 119 appear to have some functional relationship to PCMCIA expansion slots or sockets 116 and 117; slots 116 and 117 respectively receive PCMCIA cards 122 and 123. Again, however, there is no disclosure of expansion slots 116 and 117 being designed to receive cards with different respective interfaces. Even if it is assumed that the PCMCIA cards 122 and 123 have different interfaces from the disk drives 114 and 115, there is no disclosure in Richter et al. of any "receivers" for receiving cards with different respective interfaces, or of an interconnection network that allows at least some of the receivers to be connected to different controllers depending upon a pattern of zero ohm resistors. Accordingly, claim 11 should be allowed over the cited art.

Claims 14-17 and 20 all depend directly or indirectly from claim 11. Accordingly, these claims should also be allowed along with claim 11.

Claims 18 and 19 were objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but were found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 18 and 19 have been rewritten accordingly including the amendment to their parent claim 11 that was made in response to the objections to claim 11, as discussed above.

Finally, the specification has been amended to eliminate the repetition on page 2, line 1 of the phrase "pins of a 32-bit card, would be provided on the", the same phrase appears on page 1, line 27, immediately before its deleted repetition. This repetition apparently resulted from a printing error.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/7/06

By: Richard S. Koppel
Richard S. Koppel
Registration No. 26,475
Attorney for Applicants

Hewlett-Packard Company
P.O. Box 272400
Intellectual Property Administration
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
(U:MR/RSK/Amendments/Amendment/Amend. (2nd) HP19910US1)

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service, Express Mail Label EV460180800US, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date 4/7/06 Mariana M. Rivas
Mariana M. Rivas